arXiv:1703.06640v1 [math.DS] 20 Mar 2017

ON DYNAMICS GENERATED BY A UNIFORMLY CONVERGENT SEQUENCE OF MAPS

PUNEET SHARMA AND MANISH RAGHAV

Abstract. In this paper, we study the dynamics of a non-autonomous dynamical system $(X, \mathbb{F})$ generated by a sequence (f_n) of continuous self maps converging uniformly to f. We relate the dynamics of the non-autonomous system $(X, \mathbb{F})$ with the dynamics of (X, f). We prove that under certain conditions, if (f_n) converges to f at a "sufficiently fast rate", many of the dynamical properties for the systems $(X, \mathbb{F})$ and (X, f) coincide. In the process, we establish equivalence of properties like equicontinuity, minimality, proximality and various forms of mixing and sensitivity. We also investigate existence of proximal pairs and dense periodicity for the two systems. We prove that while existence of dense set of proximal pairs is equivalent for the two systems, denseness of periodic points for $(X, \mathbb{F})$ implies the denseness of periodic points for (X, f). We give example to prove that the result does not hold in the other direction. We also give examples to prove the necessity of the conditions imposed.

1. INTRODUCTION

The theory of dynamical systems has been long used to study various physical or natural processes occurring in nature. Many of these processes have been modelled using discrete or continuous systems and their long term behavior has been investigated. The theory has found applications in a variety of fields like complex systems, control theory, biomechanics and cognitive sciences. While [6] used dynamical systems theory to study the agent environment interaction in the cognitive setting, in [7] authors used dynamical systems approach to lower extremity running injuries. In [8] authors used the theory of discrete systems to model the chemical turbulence in a system. Although, the theory has been used extensively in a variety of fields, in most cases the physical/natural system is approximated

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37B20, 37B55, 54H20.

Key words and phrases. non-autonomous dynamical systems, equicontinuity, transitivity, weakly mixing, topological mixing, sensitivity, Li-Yorke sensitivity, proximal pairs.

using an autonomous system. Consequently, the governing rule f for a dynamical system is assumed to be constant with time and the dynamics of the system (X, f) is used to approximate the dynamics of the underlying system. Although such studies have resulted in good approximations of the underlying systems, better approximations can be obtained by allowing the governing rule to be time variant. As any general model approximating any natural/physical process is non-autonomous in nature, such a modification provides greater insight to the problem and hence results in a better approximation of the original system. Thus there is a strong need to investigate natural or physical systems using non-autonomous dynamical systems. As a result, some investigations for such a setting in the discrete case have been made and interesting results have been obtained. While [9] study the topological entropy when the family $\mathbb{F}$ is equicontinuous or uniformly convergent, [10] discusses minimality conditions for a non-autonomous system on a compact Hausdorff space while focussing on the case when the non-autonomous system is defined on a compact interval of the real line. In [11] authors investigate a non-autonomous system generated by a finite family of maps. In the process, they study properties like transitivity, weak mixing, topological mixing, existence of periodic points, various forms of sensitivities and Li-Yorke chaos. In [5] authors prove that if $f_n \to f$, in general there is no relation between chaotic behavior of the non-autonomous system generated by f_n and the chaotic behavior of f. In [12] authors investigate properties like weakly mixing, topological mixing, topological entropy and Li-Yorke chaos for the non-autonomous system.

In this paper, we investigate the dynamical behavior of a non-autonomous system generated by a sequence $\mathbb{F} = (f_n)$ of maps converging uniformly to f. In the process we establish relation between the dynamical behavior of the systems $(X, \mathbb{F})$ and (X, f). We prove if f commutes with each f_n and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_H(f_n, f) < \infty$, many of the dynamical properties coincide for the two systems. In particular, properties like minimality, transitivity, weakly mixing, topologically mixing are equivalent for the two systems. We also investigate properties like equicontinuity, periodicity, proximality and various forms of sensitivities. We prove that under certain conditions, while equicontinuity, proximality and different forms of sensitivities are equivalent for the two systems, existence of periodic points for $(X, \mathbb{F})$ implies existence of periodic points for the autonomous system. We give example to prove that the reverse implication of result does not hold

good. Before we move further, we give some of the basic concepts and definitions required.

Let (X, d) be a compact metric space and let $\mathbb{F} = \{f_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a family of continuous self maps on X. For any initial seed x_0, any such family generates a non-autonomous dynamical system via the relation $x_n = f_n(x_{n-1})$. Throughout this paper, such a dynamical system will be denoted by $(X, \mathbb{F})$. For any $x \in X$, $\{f_n \circ f_{n-1} \circ \ldots \circ f_1(x) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ defines the orbit of x. The objective of study of a non-autonomous dynamical system is to investigate the orbit of an arbitrary point x in X. For notational convenience, let $\omega_n(x) = f_n \circ f_{n-1} \circ \ldots \circ f_1(x)$ be the state of the system after n iterations.

A point x is called *periodic* for $(X, \mathbb{F})$ if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\omega_{nk}(x) = x$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The least such n is known as the period of the point x. A system $(X, \mathbb{F})$ is called feeble open if for any non-empty open set U in X, $int(f(U)) \neq \phi$ for all $f \in \mathbb{F}$. The system $(X, \mathbb{F})$ is equicontinuous if for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $d(x, y) < \delta$ implies $d(\omega_n(x), \omega_n(y)) < \epsilon$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x, y \in X$. The system $(X, \mathbb{F})$ is *transitive* (or $\mathbb{F}$ is transitive) if for each pair of non-empty open sets U, V in X, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\omega_n(U) \bigcap V \neq \phi$. The system $(X, \mathbb{F})$ is said to be *minimal* if it does not contain any proper non-trivial subsystems. The system $(X, \mathbb{F})$ is said to be *weakly mixing* if for any collection of non-empty open sets U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2 in X there exists a natural number n such that $\omega_n(U_i) \bigcap V_i \neq \phi$, $i = 1, 2$. Equivalently, we say that the system is weakly mixing if $\mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F}$ is transitive. The system is said to be *topologically mixing* if for every pair of non-empty open sets U, V there exists a natural number K such that $\omega_n(U) \bigcap V \neq \phi$ for all $n \geq K$. The system is said to be *sensitive* if there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for each $x \in X$ and each neighborhood U of x, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $diam(\omega_n(U)) > \delta$. If there exists $K > 0$ such that $diam(\omega_n(U)) > \delta \ \ \forall n \geq K$, then the system is *cofinitely sensitive*. A pair (x, y) is proximal for $(X, \mathbb{F})$ if $\liminf_{n\to\infty} d(\omega_n(x), \omega_n(y)) = 0$. For any $x \in X$, the set $Prox_{\mathbb{F}}(x) = \{y : (x, y)$ is proximal for $(X, \mathbb{F})\}$ is called the proximal cell of x in $(X, \mathbb{F})$. A system $(X, \mathbb{F})$ is said to exhibit dense set of proximal pairs if the set of pairs proximal for $(X, \mathbb{F})$ is dense in $X \times X$. A set S is said to be δ-*scrambled* in $(X, \mathbb{F})$ if for any distinct $x, y \in S$, $\limsup_{n\to\infty} d(\omega_n(x), \omega_n(y)) > \delta$ but $\liminf_{n\to\infty} d(\omega_n(x), \omega_n(y)) = 0$. A system $(X, \mathbb{F})$ is Li-Yorke sensitive if there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for each $x \in X$ and each neighborhood

U of x there exists $y \in U$ such that (x, y) is a δ-scrambled set. For any $x \in X$, let $LY_{\mathbb{F}}(x) = \{y \in X : (x, y)$ is a Li-Yorke pair for $(X, \mathbb{F})\}$ is called the Li-Yorke cell of x. It may be noted that in case the f_n's coincide, the above definitions coincide with the known notions of an autonomous dynamical system. See [2, 3, 4] for details.

Let (X, d) be a compact metric space and let $C(X)$ denote the collection of continuous self maps on X. For any $f, g \in C(X)$, define,

$$D(f, g) = \sup_{x \in X} d(f(x), g(x))$$

It is easily seen that D defined above is a metric on $C(X)$ and is known as the *Supremum metric*. It can be seen that a sequence (f_n) in $C(X)$ converges to f in $(C(X), D)$ if and only if f_n converges to f uniformly on X and hence the topology generated by the metric defined above is known as the topology of uniform convergence.

2. Main Results

Proposition 1. *Let $(X, \mathbb{F})$ be a non-autonomous system generated by $\mathbb{F}$ and let f be any continuous self map on X. If the family $\mathbb{F}$ commutes with f then for any $x \in X$ and any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $d(\omega_k(x), f^k(x)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} D(f_i, f)$.*

Proof. Let $x \in X$ and n be a natural number. As f_k's commute with f, $d(f_2 \circ f_1(x), f^2(x)) \leq d(f_2 \circ f_1(x), f \circ f_1(x)) + d(f \circ f_1(x), f \circ f(x)) = d(f_2 \circ f_1(x), f \circ f_1(x)) + d(f_1 \circ f(x), f \circ f(x)) \leq D(f_2, f) + D(f_1, f)$. Proceeding inductively, if $d(f_n \circ f_{n-1} \circ \ldots \circ f_1(x), f^n(x)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} D(f_i, f)$, then, $d(f_{n+1} \circ f_n \circ \ldots \circ f_1(x), f^{n+1}(x)) \leq d(f_{n+1} \circ f_n \circ \ldots \circ f_1(x), f \circ f_n \circ \ldots \circ f_1(x)) + d(f \circ f_n \circ \ldots \circ f_1(x), f^{n+1}(x)) = d(f_{n+1} \circ f_n \circ \ldots \circ f_1(x), f \circ f_n \circ \ldots \circ f_1(x) + d(f_n \circ f_{n-1} \circ \ldots \circ f_1 \circ f(x), f^n \circ f(x)) \leq D(f_{n+1}, f) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} D(f_i, f)$ (by induction). Hence for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $d(f_k \circ f_{k-1} \circ \ldots \circ f_1(x), f^k(x)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} D(f_i, f)$ or $d(\omega_k(x), f^k(x)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} D(f_i, f)$. □

Remark 1. The above result captures the deviations in the orbit of the non-autonomous system, when approximated by an autonomous system (X, f). Consequently, the result provides an upper bound for the error in the approximation of the trajectory of the non-autonomous system, when approximated using the system (X, f). It may be noted

that as error after k iterations is bounded by $\sum_{i=1}^{k} D(f_i, f)$, if (f_n) converges to f with order more than $O(\frac{1}{n^r})$ $(r > 1)$, the total error for the system remains bounded. Further, if (f_n) converges faster than $O(\frac{1}{n^r})$, approximating the trajectory after its observation for finite time leads to a better approximation. In particular, an arbitrarily small bound for the error can be obtained if approximation process is initiated after finitely many iterations. Thus, we get the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Let* $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *be a non-autonomous system generated by* $\mathbb{F}$ *and let* f *be any continuous self map on* X*. If the family* $\mathbb{F}$ *commutes with* f *then for any* $x \in X$ *and any* $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $d(\omega_{n+k}(x), f^k(\omega_n(x))) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} D(f_{n+i}, f)$

Proof. The result is trivial by approximating the trajectory of $x_0 = \omega_n(x)$ for k iterations when $\mathbb{F} = \{f_{n+1} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. □

Remark 2. The corollary establishes that if (f_n) converge to f at a sufficiently fast rate, approximating the trajectory of the system after observing for finite time reduces the error and hence leads to a better approximation. As a result, the trajectory of the non-autonomous system can be approximated using an autonomous system with sufficient accuracy (and vice-versa) if the system is observed initially for sufficient amount of time. Consequently, various forms of mixing properties (like transitivity, weakly mixing and topological mixing) and sensitivities (like sensitivity and cofinite sensitivity) are expected to be equivalent for the two systems. It may be noted that as it is established that trajectory of either of the systems can be traced using the other (under stated conditions), it is expected that the dynamical behavior of the two systems is deeply related and such results do not come as a surprise. We now establish the results stated.

Proposition 2. *Let* $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *be a non-autonomous system generated by a family* $\mathbb{F}$ *commuting with* f*. If* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$ *then* (X, f) *is equicontinuous* $\Rightarrow$ $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *is equicontinuous. Further, if* f_i*'s are bijective then,* $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *is equicontinuous* $\Rightarrow$ (X, f) *is equicontinuous.*

Proof. Let (X, f) be equicontinuous and let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. By equicontinuity, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $d(x, y) < \delta$ implies $d(f^n(x), f^n(y)) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. As $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$, choose $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{n=r}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$ and hence for any $x \in X$, by corollary 1 we have,

$d(\omega_{r+k}(x), f^k(\omega_r(x))) < \sum_{i=1}^{k} D(f_{r+i}, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$. As ω_r is continuous, choose $\eta_r > 0$ such that $d(x, y) < \eta_r$ implies $d(\omega_r(x), \omega_r(y)) < \delta$ and hence $d(f^k(\omega_r(x)), f^k(\omega_r(y))) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By triangle inequality, $d(x, y) < \eta_r$ implies $d(\omega_{r+k}(x), \omega_{r+k}(y)) < \epsilon$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ or $d(\omega_k(x), \omega_k(y)) < \epsilon$ for all $k \geq r + 1$. Further, as $\{\omega_1, \omega_2, \ldots, \omega_r\}$ is a finite set, there exists $\eta_r' > 0$ such that $d(x, y) < \eta_r'$ forces $d(\omega_i(x), \omega_i(y)) < \epsilon$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$ and hence choosing $\eta = \min\{\eta_r, \eta_r'\}$ ensures equicontinuity of $(X, \mathbb{F})$.

Conversely, let f_i's be bijective and let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. By equicontinuity of $(X, \mathbb{F})$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $d(x, y) < \delta$ implies $d(\omega_n(x), \omega_n(y)) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. As $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$, choose $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{n=r}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$. Also bijectivity of f_i implies ω_r is a homeomorphism and thus there exists $\eta_r > 0$ such that $d(x, y) < \eta_r$ implies $d(\omega_r^{-1}(x), \omega_r^{-1}(y)) < \delta$. Let $x, y \in X$ such that $d(x, y) < \eta_r$. Let $x_r = \omega_r^{-1}(x)$ and $y_r = \omega_r^{-1}(y)$. It may be noted that $d(f^k(x), f^k(y)) = d(f^k(\omega_r(x_r)), f^k(\omega_r(y_r))) \leq d(f^k(\omega_r(x_r)), \omega_{r+k}(x_r)) + d(\omega_{r+k}(x_r), \omega_{r+k}(y_r)) + d(\omega_{r+k}(y_r), f^k(\omega_r(y_r)))$. By corollary 1, $d(\omega_{r+k}(x_r), f^k(\omega_r(x_r))) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} D(f_{r+i}, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$ and $d(\omega_{r+k}(y_r), f^k(\omega_r(y_r))) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} D(f_{r+i}, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$. Also $d(x, y) < \eta_r$ implies $d(x_r, y_r) < \delta$ and hence by equicontinuity we have $d(\omega_{r+k}(x_r), \omega_{r+k}(y_r)) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$. By triangle inequality $d(f^k(\omega_r(x_r)), f^k(\omega_r(y_r))) < \epsilon$ or $d(f^k(x), f^k(y)) < \epsilon$. As the proof holds for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, (X, f) is equicontinuous. □

Remark 3. The above result establishes the relation between equicontinuity of the two systems (X, f) and $(X, \mathbb{F})$. While a "sufficiently fast rate of convergence" is enough to establish the equicontinuity of $(X, \mathbb{F})$ from equicontinuity of (X, f), the proof uses additional assumption of bijectivity of the generating functions f_i to establish the converse. However, it may be noted that the converse part does not use the bijectivity completely and the result holds good under a much weaker assumption. In particular, if every pair of nearby points can be obtained from nearby points, a similar proof of the converse holds good and the equicontinuity of the two systems is still equivalent. We say that a system $(X, \mathbb{F})$ exhibits "nearness criteria" if for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$, such that for every pair of points $x, y \in X$ with $d(x, y) < \delta$, there exists $u, v \in X$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\omega_r(u) = x, \omega_r(v) = y$ and $d(u, v) < \epsilon$. The definition is analogous to the continuity of the inverse and is equivalent to continuity of each fibre

of the inverse. In view of this definition, the above result yields the following corollary.

Corollary 2. *Let* $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *be a non-autonomous system generated by a family* $\mathbb{F}$ *commuting with* f*. If* $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *satisfies nearness criteria and* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$ *then* (X, f) *is equicontinuous* $\Leftrightarrow$ $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *is equicontinuous.*

Proposition 3. *Let* $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *be a non-autonomous system generated by a sequence* $\mathbb{F}$ *commuting with* f*. If* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$ *then* (X, f) *is minimal* $\Leftrightarrow$ $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *is minimal.*

Proof. Let (X, f) be minimal and let $x \in X$. Let U be any non-empty open set in X. Choose $u \in U$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $S(u, \epsilon) \subset U$. As $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$, there exists $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{n=r}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. As (X, f) is minimal, orbit of $\omega_r(x)$(under f) is dense in X and there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f^k(\omega_r(x)) \in S(u, \frac{\epsilon}{2})$. Also by corollary 1, $d(\omega_{r+k}(x), f^k(\omega_r(x))) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} D(f_{r+i}, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Thus, by triangle inequality, $d(\omega_{r+k}(x), u) \leq d(\omega_{r+k}(x), f^k(\omega_r(x))) + d(f^k(\omega_r(x)), u) < \epsilon$ and hence $\omega_{r+k}(x) \in S(u, \epsilon) \subset U$. As the proof holds good for any non-empty open set U of X, orbit of x (under $\mathbb{F}$) is dense in X. As the proof holds good for any $x \in X$ we establish that $(X, \mathbb{F})$ is minimal.

Conversely, let $(X, \mathbb{F})$ be minimal and let $x \in X$. Let U be any non-empty open set in X. Choose $u \in U$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $S(u, \epsilon) \subset U$. As $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$, there exists $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{n=r}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. As $(X, \mathbb{F})$ is minimal, orbit of any $y \in \omega_r^{-1}(x)$(under $\mathbb{F}$) is dense in X and hence intersects $S(u, \frac{\epsilon}{2})$. Further, as the orbit intersects $S(u, \eta)$ for each η, the set $\{n : \omega_n(y) \in S(u, \frac{\epsilon}{2})\}$ is infinite and there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\omega_{r+k}(y) \in S(u, \frac{\epsilon}{2})$. Also by corollary 1, $d(\omega_{r+k}(y), f^k(\omega_r(y))) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} D(f_{r+i}, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and hence by triangle inequality, $d(f^k(\omega_r(y)), u) < \epsilon$ or $d(f^k(x), u) < \epsilon$ and hence $f^k(x) \in U$. As the proof holds good for any non-empty open set U, orbit of x(under f) is dense in X. As the proof holds good for any $x \in X$, (X, f) is minimal. □

Proposition 4. *Let* $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *be a non-autonomous system generated by a family* $\mathbb{F}$ *of feeble open maps commuting with* f*. If* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$ *then* (X, f) *is transitive* $\Leftrightarrow$ $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *is transitive.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given and let $U = S(x, \epsilon)$ and $V = S(y, \epsilon)$ be two non-empty open sets in X. As $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$, $\exists\ r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{n=r}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. As the family $\mathbb{F}$ is feeble open, $int(\omega_r(U))$ is non-empty open and thus by transitivity of (X, f), for open sets $U' = int(\omega_r(U))$ and $V' = S(y, \frac{\epsilon}{2})$ there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f^m(U') \cap V' \neq \phi$. Consequently there exists $u' \in U'$ such that $f^m(u') \in V'$. Further, as $U' = int(\omega_r(U))$, there exists $u \in U$ such that $u' = \omega_r(u)$ and hence $f^m(\omega_r(u)) \in V'$.

Also, from corollary 1, we have $d(\omega_{m+r}(u), f^m(\omega_r(u))) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} D(f_{r+i}, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. By triangle inequality $d(y, \omega_{m+r}(u)) < \epsilon$ and hence $\omega_{m+r}(U) \cap V \neq \phi$. As the proof holds for any pair of non-empty open sets $S(x, \epsilon), S(y, \epsilon)$ in X, the proof holds for any pair of non-empty open sets in X. Hence $(X, \mathbb{F})$ is transitive.

Conversely, let $\epsilon > 0$ be given and let $S(x, \epsilon)$ and $S(y, \epsilon)$ be two non-empty open sets in X. As $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$, choose $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{n=r}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Further, transitivity of a system forces any open set U to visit $S(y, \frac{1}{m})$ for each m and hence the set of times when any non-empty open set U visits $S(y, \epsilon)$ is infinite. Applying transitivity to open sets $U = \omega_r^{-1}(S(x, \epsilon))$ and $V = S(y, \frac{\epsilon}{2})$ we can choose k such that $\omega_{r+k}(U) \cap V \neq \phi$. Consequently, there exists $u \in U$ such that $d(\omega_{r+k}(u), y) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Also by corollary 1, $d(\omega_{r+k}(u), f^k(\omega_r(u))) < \sum_{i=1}^{k} D(f_{r+i}, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and hence by triangle inequality $d(y, f^k(\omega_r(u))) < \epsilon$. As $\omega_r(u) \in S(x, \epsilon)$ we have $f^k(S(x, \epsilon)) \cap S(y, \epsilon) \neq \phi$. As the proof holds for any choice of non-empty open sets $S(x, \epsilon)$ and $S(y, \epsilon)$, the system (X, f) is transitive. □

Remark 4. For a sequence (f_n) converging uniformly to f, the above proof establishes relation between transitivity of non-autonomous system generated by (f_n) and transitivity of (X, f) in terms of the rate of convergence. It is established that for a sequence of commuting feeble open maps, if (f_n) converges to f fast enough, then transitivity of autonomous system is equivalent to the transitivity of the non-autonomous part. However, it may be noted that the converse part does not use the feeble openness of the maps f_n and hence transitivity of the non-autonomous system is carried forward to (X, f) if the

convergence is not "too slow". The result is intuitive and establishes the fact that if f_n's can catch up with f fast enough, then the difference in trajectories is not sufficient to disturb the transitive nature of the system. It may be noted that if $N_f(U,V)/N_{\mathbb{F}}(U,V)$ denotes the set of times when an open set U visits V under $f/\mathbb{F}$, the proof establishes that for each pair of open sets U, V, there exists a pair of open sets U', V' of open sets such that the set of times of interactions of U and V under $\mathbb{F}$ contains the translates (by a fixed number depending on the diameter of open sets and the rate of convergence) of set of times of interactions of U' and V' under f(and vice-versa). As the argument depends on the diameter of open sets and not on open sets themselves, a argument similar to above holds good for two pairs U_1, U_2 and V_1, V_2 of non-empty open sets in X and hence weakly mixing is also equivalent for the two systems. We include the proof for the sake of completion.

Proposition 5. *Let* $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *be a non-autonomous system generated by a family* $\mathbb{F}$ *of feeble open maps commuting with* f. *If* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$ *then* (X, f) *is weakly mixing* $\Leftrightarrow$ $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *is weakly mixing.*

Proof. Let U_1, U_2 and V_1, V_2 be a pair of two non-empty open sets in X. Without loss of generality, let $U_i = S(u_i, \epsilon)$ $V_i = S(v_i, \epsilon)$ for $i = 1, 2$. As $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$, $\exists\, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{n=r}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. As f_i are feeble open U_i' =int$(\omega_r(U_i))$ is open, applying weak mixing of f to pairs U_1', U_2' and V_1', V_2' (where $V_i' = S(v_i, \frac{\epsilon}{2})$), there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f^k(U_i') \cap V_i' \neq \phi$. A proof similar to the transitive case establishes existence of $u_i \in U_i$ such that $\omega_{k+r}(u_i) \in V_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ and hence the system $(X, \mathbb{F})$ is weakly mixing.

Conversely, let $\epsilon > 0$ be given and let U_1, U_2 and V_1, V_2 be two non-empty open sets in X. Once again, as $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$, $\exists\, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{n=r}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Further, continuity of ω_r implies $U_i' = \omega_r^{-1}(U_i)$ is open in X. Applying weak mixing of the system $(X, \mathbb{F})$ to pairs of open sets U_1', U_2' and V_1', V_2' (where $V_i' = S(v_i, \frac{\epsilon}{2})$), a proof similar to the transitive case establishes existence of $u_i \in U_i$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f^k(u_i) \in V_i$ and hence (X, f) is weakly mixing. □

Remark 5. The above result generalises proposition 4 and establishes the equivalence of weakly mixing for the two systems under stated conditions. As a result, feeble openness of f_n's is redundant for

the converse part and hence the proof holds good even when the maps f_n generating the non-autonomous system are not feeble open. As for each pair of open sets U, V there exists a pair of open sets U', V' of open sets such that the set of times of interactions of U and V in the non-autonomous system contains the translates (by a fixed number depending on the diameter of open sets and the rate of convergence) of set of times of interactions of U' and V' in the autonomous system (and vice-versa), cofiniteness of the set of times of interactions between any two non-empty open sets for the two systems is equivalent. Consequently, an identical argument establishes the equivalence of topological mixing for the two systems. Thus we get the following corollary.

Corollary 3. *Let* $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *be a non-autonomous system generated by a family* $\mathbb{F}$ *of feeble open maps commuting with* f*. If* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$ *then* (X, f) *is topologically mixing* $\Leftrightarrow$ $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *is topologically mixing.*

Proposition 6. *Let* $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *be a non-autonomous system generated by a family* $\mathbb{F}$ *commuting with* f*. If* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$ *then, x is periodic for* $(X, \mathbb{F}) \Rightarrow$ *x is periodic for* (X, f)*.*

Proof. Let x be periodic for $(X, \mathbb{F})$ with period k and let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. As $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$, choose $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{n=r}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \epsilon$. As x is periodic, $\omega_{rk+k}(x) = x$. Also by corollary 1, $d(\omega_{rk+k}(x), f^k(\omega_{rk}(x))) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} D(f_{rk+i}, f) < \epsilon$. As $\omega_{rk+k}(x) = \omega_{rk}(x) = x$, we have $d(f^k(x), x) < \epsilon$. As the proof holds for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have $d(f^k(x), x) = 0$ and hence x is periodic for (X, f). □

Remark 6. The result establishes that if x is periodic for $(X, \mathbb{F})$ then x is periodic for (X, f). The proof once again relies on the rate of convergence of the sequence (f_n) and holds good only when the convergence is fast enough. Consequently if $(X, \mathbb{F})$ has dense set of periodic points then (X, f) also exhibits dense set of periodic points. However, the results only establishes the preservance of periodic points in one direction and existence of periodic points (or dense set of periodic points) is not equivalent for the two systems.

Corollary 4. *Let* $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *be a non-autonomous system generated by a family* $\mathbb{F}$ *of feeble open maps commuting with* f*. If* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$ *then,* $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *has dense set of periodic points* $\Rightarrow$ (X, f) *has dense set of periodic points.*

Example 1. *Let S^1 denote the unit circle and let $\mathbb{F} = \{f_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ where $f_n : S^1 \to S^1$ is defined as $f_n(\theta) = \theta + \frac{1}{n^2}$. Then f_n's are rotations on unit circle converging uniformly to identity I and hence every point is periodic (recurrent) for (S^1, I). However, as $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{6} < 2\pi$, the non-autonomous system $(S^1, \mathbb{F})$ does not have any periodic(or recurrent) point and hence the converse of the above result is not true.*

We now turn our attention to various forms of sensitivities for the two systems.

Proposition 7. *Let $(X, \mathbb{F})$ be a non-autonomous system generated by a family $\mathbb{F}$ of feeble open maps commuting with f. If $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$ then (X, f) is sensitive $\Leftrightarrow$ $(X, \mathbb{F})$ is sensitive.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given and let $U = S(u, \epsilon)$ a non-empty open set in X. As $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$, by corollay 1 we obtain, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(\omega_{n+k}(x), f^k(\omega_n(x))) < \epsilon$ for all $x \in X, k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $\delta > 0$ be constant of sensitivity for f and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{1}{m} < \frac{\delta}{4}$. Thus, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(\omega_{n_0+k}(x), f^k(\omega_{n_0}(x))) < \frac{1}{m}$ for all $x \in X, k \in \mathbb{N}$. As f_n's are feeble open, $\omega_{n_0}(U)$ is feeble open and hence sensitivity of f implies there exists $v_1, v_2 \in \omega_{n_0}(U)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(f^k(v_1), f^k(v_2)) > \delta$. As $v_1, v_2 \in \omega_{n_0}(U)$, there exists $v_1', v_2' \in U$ such that $v_1 = \omega_{n_0}(v_1')$ and $v_2 = \omega_{n_0}(v_2')$ and hence $d(f^k(\omega_{n_0}(v_1')), f^k(\omega_{n_0}(v_2'))) > \delta$. Also $d(\omega_{n_0+k}(v_i'), f^k(\omega_{n_0}(v_i'))) < \frac{1}{m}$ for $i = 1, 2$ and thus by triangle inequality $d(\omega_{n_0+k}(v_1'), \omega_{n_0+k}(v_2')) > \delta - \frac{2}{m} > \frac{\delta}{2}$. Thus we obtain $v_1', v_2' \in U$ such that $d(\omega_{n_0+k}(v_1'), \omega_{n_0+k}(v_2')) > \frac{\delta}{2}$ and hence $(X, \mathbb{F})$ is sensitive.

Conversely, let $(X, \mathbb{F})$ be sensitive with sensitivity constant δ and let U be non-empty open in X. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{1}{m} < \frac{\delta}{4}$. Thus, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(\omega_{n_0+k}(x), f^k(\omega_{n_0}(x))) < \frac{1}{m}$ for all $x \in X, k \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, as sensitivity of $(X, \mathbb{F})$ ensures existence of $k_n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $diam(\omega_{k_n}(S(x, \frac{1}{n}))) > \delta$, the set $\{k : diam(\omega_k(S(x, \frac{1}{n}))) > \delta\}$ is infinite. Consequently, for any non-empty open set U, the set of times k when $diam(\omega_k(U)) > \delta$ is infinite. Thus, for the open set $\omega_{n_0}^{-1}(U)$, there exists $v_1, v_2 \in \omega_{n_0}^{-1}(U)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(\omega_{n_0+k}(v_1), \omega_{n_0+k}(v_2)) > \delta$. As $v_1, v_2 \in \omega_{n_0}^{-1}(U)$, there exists $v_1', v_2' \in U$ such that $v_1' = \omega_{n_0}(v_1)$ and $v_2' = \omega_{n_0}(v_2)$ and hence $d(f_{n_0+k} \circ \dots f_{n_0+1}(v_1'), f_{n_0+k} \circ \dots f_{n_0+1}(v_2')) > \delta$.

Also $d(\omega_{n_0+k}(v_i), f^k(\omega_{n_0}(v_i))) < \frac{1}{m}$ or $d(\omega_{n_0+k}(v_i), f^k(v_i')) < \frac{1}{m}$ for $i = 1, 2$ and thus by triangle inequality $d(f^k(v_1'), f^k(v_2')) > \delta - \frac{2}{m} > \frac{\delta}{2}$. Thus we obtain $v_1', v_2' \in U$ such that $d(f^k(v_1'), f^k(v_2')) > \frac{\delta}{2}$ and hence (X, f) is sensitive. □

Remark 7. The above result provides sufficient conditions under which the sensitivity of the two systems $(X, \mathbb{F})$ and (X, f) is equivalent. It is established that if the convergence is fast enough, feeble openness ensures that the sensitivity of (X, f) implies sensitivity of $(X, \mathbb{F})$. However for the converse part, feeble openness is redundant and rate of convergence is sufficient to preserve the sensitivity in the other direction. Further, the choice of $m(\frac{1}{m} < \frac{\delta}{4})$ is arbitrary and can be made finer which in turn ensures greater separability of points for the systems considered. Hence the constant of sensitivity is preserved during preservance of sensitivity and the two systems are sensitive with same constant of sensitivity. The above proof establishes that for any pair of distinct points $x, y \in X$ there exists points x', y' such that the set of times of separation of x and y in the non-autonomous system contains the translates (by a fixed number depending on the rate of convergence) of set of times of separation of x' and y' in the autonomous system (and vice-versa). In particular, a similar argument establishes that for any non-empty open set U, there exists a non-empty open set U' such that the set of times of expansivity of U in the non-autonomous system contains the translates (by a fixed number depending on the rate of convergence) of set of times of expansitivity of U' in the autonomous system and vice-versa. Consequently, if the autonomous(non-autonomous) system is cofinitely sensitive then non-autonomos(autonomous) system is also cofinite sensitive and hence cofinite sensitivity is equivalent for the two systems.

Corollary 5. *Let* $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *be a non-autonomous system generated by a family* $\mathbb{F}$ *of feable open maps commuting with* f. *If* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$ *then* (X, f) *is cofinitely sensitive* $\Leftrightarrow$ $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *is cofinitely sensitive.*

Proposition 8. *Let* X *be compact and let* $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *be a sensitive non-autonomous system generated by a family* $\mathbb{F}$. *Then for any* $x \in X$, $Prox_{\mathbb{F}}(x)$ *is dense in* $X \Leftrightarrow LY_{\mathbb{F}}(x)$ *is dense in* X.

Proof. For any $x \in X$, it may be noted that if $(X, \mathbb{F})$ is sensitive with sensitivity constant δ, then for any $y \in X$ and any neighborhood U_y of y, there exists $y' \in U_y$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(\omega_n(y), \omega_n(y')) > \delta$. By triangle inequality, $d(\omega_n(x), \omega_n(y)) > \frac{\delta}{2}$ or $d(\omega_n(x), \omega_n(y')) > \frac{\delta}{2}$ and hence the set of points $\frac{\delta}{2}$-sensitive to x are dense in X.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be fixed. For any $x \in X$ and any non-empty open subset U of X, let V be non-empty open such that $V \subset \overline{V} \subset U$. As $Prox_{\mathbb{F}}(x)$ is dense in X, there exists $y \in V$ such that the pair (x, y) is proximal and hence there exists $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(\omega_{n_1}(x), \omega_{n_1}(y)) < \epsilon$. By continuity, there exists a neighborhood $U_1 (\subset V)$ of y such that $d(\omega_{n_1}(x), \omega_{n_1}(u_1)) < \epsilon$ for all $u_1 \in U_1$. As the set of points $\frac{\delta}{2}$-sensitive to x are dense in X, there exists $y_1 \in U_1$ and $m_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(\omega_{m_1}(x), \omega_{m_1}(y_1)) > \frac{\delta}{2}$ and once again by continuity there exists a neighborhood $V_1 (\subset U_1 \subset V)$ of y_1 such that $d(\omega_{n_1}(x), \omega_{n_1}(v_1)) < \epsilon$ and $d(\omega_{m_1}(x), \omega_{m_1}(v_1)) > \frac{\delta}{2}$ for all $v_1 \in V_1$. Hence for $\epsilon > 0$ and any pair x, U (where $x \in X$ and U is non-empty open subset of X) there exists $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and a non-empty open subset U_ϵ of X (satisfying $U_\epsilon \subset \overline{U_\epsilon} \subset U$) such that $d(\omega_m(x), \omega_m(u)) > \frac{\delta}{2}$ and $d(\omega_n(x), \omega_n(u)) < \epsilon$ for all $u \in U_\epsilon$.

Let $x \in X$ and U be any non-empty open subset of X. By argument above there exists non-empty open set U_1, $U_1 \subset \overline{U_1} \subset U$ and $n_1, m_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(\omega_{m_1}(x), \omega_{m_1}(y)) > \frac{\delta}{2}$ and $d(\omega_{n_1}(x), \omega_{n_1}(y)) < \frac{1}{2}$ for all $y \in U_1$. Repeating the process for the pair (x, U_1), there exists U_2 satisfying $U_2 \subset \overline{U_2} \subset U_1$ and $n_2, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(\omega_{m_2}(x), \omega_{m_2}(y)) > \frac{\delta}{2}$ and $d(\omega_{n_2}(x), \omega_{n_2}(y)) < \frac{1}{4}$ for all $y \in U_2$. Inductively, we obtain a decreasing sequence U_k of non-empty open subsets of X such that $U_k \subset \overline{U_k} \subset U_{k-1}$ and sequences $(n_k), (m_k) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(\omega_{m_k}(x), \omega_{m_k}(y)) > \frac{\delta}{2}$ and $d(\omega_{n_k}(x), \omega_{n_k}(y)) < \frac{1}{2^k}$ for all $y \in U_k$. As X is compact $\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \overline{U_k} \neq \phi$. Then for any $u \in \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \overline{U_k}$, we have $d(\omega_{m_k}(x), \omega_{m_k}(u)) > \frac{\delta}{2}$ and $d(\omega_{n_k}(x), \omega_{n_k}(u) < \frac{1}{2^k}$ for all k and hence (x, u) is a Li-Yorke pair. As the argument holds good for any non-empty open set U, $LY_{\mathbb{F}}(x)$ is dense in X.

As every Li-Yorke pair is proximal, proof of the converse part is trivial. □

Remark 8. The result establishes that for sensitive systems, if proximal cells are dense in X for $(X, \mathbb{F})$ then Li-Yorke cells are also dense. It may be noted that the result does not use the compactness of the space X completely and holds good for locally compact spaces also. Further, the proof does not use denseness of the proximal cell completely and establishes that for a sensitive system, if proximal cell of a point x is dense in a neighborhood of x then Li-Yorke cell is dense in a neighborhood of x. Consequently, a similar argument establishes that for a sensitive system, if proximal cell of a point x is dense in a neighborhood of x then x is point of Li-Yorke sensitivity. The result is

a natural extension of the result established in [1] for the autonomous systems.

Corollary 6. *Let (X, f) be a compact sensitive system. Then for any $x \in X$, $Prox(x)$ is dense in $X \Leftrightarrow LY(x)$ is dense in X.*

Proposition 9. *Let $(X, \mathbb{F})$ be a non-autonomous system generated by a family $\mathbb{F}$ commuting with f. If $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$ then, (x, y) is proximal for $(X, f) \Rightarrow (x, y)$ is proximal for $(X, \mathbb{F})$.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given and let (x, y) be proximal for (X, f). As (x, y) is proximal, there exists a sequence (n_k) in $\mathbb{N}$ such that $\lim_{n_k \to \infty} d(f^{n_k}(x), f^{n_k}(y)) = 0$. As $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$, choose $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{n=r}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$. As ω_r is continuous (and hence uniformly continuous), there exists $\eta > 0$ such that for any $u, v \in X$, $d(u, v) < \eta$ implies $d(\omega_r(u), \omega_r(v)) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$. As (x, y) is proximal for (X, f), there exists $n_k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(f^{n_k}(x), f^{n_k}(y)) < \eta$ and hence $d(\omega_r(f^{n_k}(x)), \omega_r(f^{n_k}(y))) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$ or $d(f^{n_k}(\omega_r(x)), f^{n_k}(\omega_r(y))) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$ (by commutativity). Also by corollary 1, $d(\omega_{r+n_k}(u), f^{n_k}(\omega_r(u))) < \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D(f_{r+i}, f) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$ for any element u in X. Thus by triangle inequality, $d(\omega_{r+n_k}(x), \omega_{r+n_k}(y)) \leq d(\omega_{r+n_k}(x), f^{n_k}(\omega_r(x))) + d(f^{n_k}(\omega_r(x)), f^{n_k}(\omega_r(y))) + d(f^{n_k}(\omega_r(y)), f^{n_k}(\omega_r(y))) < \epsilon$. As the proof works for any $\epsilon > 0$, (x, y) is proximal for $(X, \mathbb{F})$. □

Proposition 10. *Let X be compact and let $(X, \mathbb{F})$ be a non-autonomous system generated by a family $\mathbb{F}$ commuting with f. If $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$ then, proximal cell of each x is dense for $(X, f) \Leftrightarrow$ proximal cell of each x is dense for $(X, \mathbb{F})$.*

Proof. As every pair proximal for (X, f) is proximal for $(X, \mathbb{F})$, if $\text{Prox}(x)$ is dense for (X, f) then $\text{Prox}(x)$ is also dense for $(X, \mathbb{F})$ and the proof of forward part is complete.

Conversely let $Prox_{\mathbb{F}}(x)$ be dense for each $x \in X$. Fix $x \in X$ and let U be a non-empty open subset of X. Let U_1 be non-empty open such that $\overline{U_1} \subset U$. As $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$, for each $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ there exists $r_m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{n=r_m}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \frac{1}{3.2^m}$. Fix $m = 1$ and let $V_m = \omega_{r_m}^{-1}(U_m)$. Then V_m is open in X. Pick any $x_m \in \omega_{r_m}^{-1}(x)$. As $Prox_{\mathbb{F}}(x_m)$ is dense for $(X, \mathbb{F})$, there exists a $z_m = \omega_{r_m}^{-1}(y_m) \in V_m$ ($y_m \in U_m$) such that (x_m, z_m) is proximal for $(X, \mathbb{F})$. Thus, there exists a sequence $(n_{k,m})$

in $\mathbb{N}$ such that $\lim_{n_{k,m}\to\infty} d(\omega_{n_{k,m}+r_m}(x_m), \omega_{n_{k,m}+r_m}(z_m)) = 0$. Choose $s_m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(\omega_{s_m+r_m}(x_m), \omega_{s_m+r_m}(z_m)) < \frac{1}{3.2^m}$. Also, by corollary 1, for any $w \in X$, $d(\omega_{s_m+r_m}(w), f^{s_m}(\omega_{r_m}(w))) < \sum_{i=1}^{s_m} D(f_{r_m+i}, f) < \frac{1}{3.2^m}$ and hence by triangle inequality, we have $d(f^{s_m}(\omega_{r_m}(x_m)), f^{s_m}(\omega_{r_m}(z_m))) < \frac{1}{2^m}$ or $d(f^{s_m}(x), f^{s_m}(y_m)) < \frac{1}{2^m}$. By continuity, there exists neighborhood U_{m+1} of y_m such that $\overline{U_{m+1}} \subset U_m$ and $d(f^{s_m}(\omega_{r_m}(x)), f^{s_m}(\omega_{r_m}(y))) < \frac{1}{2^m}$ for all $y \in U_{m+1}$.

Repeating the process for pair (x, U_m) (for each m), we obtain a open set U_{m+1}, $\overline{U_{m+1}} \subset U_m \subset U$ and $s_m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(f^{s_m}(x), f^{s_m}(y)) < \frac{1}{2^m}$ for all $y \in U_{m+1}$. As $\overline{U_{m+1}}$ is a nested decreasing sequence of closed sets in a compact metric space and hence $\bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \overline{U_m} \neq \phi$. Then, for any $u \in \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \overline{U_m} \subset U$, as $u \in U_m$ for all m, we have $d(f^{s_m}(x), f^{s_m}(u)) < \frac{1}{2^m}$ for all m and hence the pair (x, u) is proximal for (X, f). As the proof holds good for any non-empty open set U in X, $Prox_f(x)$ is dense in X. □

Remark 9. The above proof establishes that proximal cell of each x is dense for (X, f) if and only if proximal cell of each x is dense for $(X, \mathbb{F})$ and hence the dynamical behavior of two systems in equivalent in this regard. However, the proof does not exploit the denseness condition and establishes that denseness of proximal cells in some neighborhood is equivalent for the two systems. Further, by Proposition 8, if a system is sensitive then denseness of proximal cells and Li-Yorke cells is equivalent for the two systems. Equivalently, if proximal cells are dense for a system then the system is sensitive if and only if it is Li-Yorke sensitive. As sensitivity is equivalent for feeble open systems (with sufficiently fast rate of convergence), we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 7. *Let* $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *be a non-autonomous system generated by a family* $\mathbb{F}$ *of feeble open maps commuting with* f *satisfying* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$. *If* $Prox(x)$ *is dense in* X *for each* $x \in X$, *then* (X, f) *is Li-Yorke sensitive* $\Leftrightarrow$ $(X, \mathbb{F})$ *is Li-Yorke sensitive.*

Proof. The result is a direct consequence of Proposition 7 and Remark 9. □

We now establish equivalence of denseness of proximal pairs for the two systems.

Proposition 11. *Let X be compact and let $(X, \mathbb{F})$ be a non-autonomous system generated by a family $\mathbb{F}$ of feable open maps commuting with f. If $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$ then, set of proximal pairs is dense for $(X, f) \Leftrightarrow$ set of proximal pairs is dense for $(X, \mathbb{F})$.*

Proof. As every pair proximal for (X, f) is proximal for $(X, \mathbb{F})$, if (X, f) has dense set of proximal pairs then $(X, \mathbb{F})$ has dense set of proximal pairs.

Conversely, let $(X, \mathbb{F})$ exhibit dense set of proximal pairs and let $U_1 \times U_2$ be any non-empty open set in $X \times X$. Let U_i' be non-empty open such that $\overline{U_i'} \subset U_i$. As $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \infty$, for each $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ there exists $r_m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{n=r_m}^{\infty} D(f_n, f) < \frac{1}{3.2^m}$.Fix $m = 0$ and let $U_{1,m} = U_1'$ and $U_{2,m} = U_2'$. For $i = 1, 2$, let $V_{i,m} = \omega_{r_m}^{-1}(U_{i,m})$. Then $V_{1,m} \times V_{2,m}$ is open in $X \times X$. Consequently there exists a $(x_{1,m}, x_{2,m}) \in V_{1,m} \times V_{2,m}$ such that $(x_{1,m}, x_{2,m})$ is proximal for $(X, \mathbb{F})$ and hence there exists a sequence $(n_{k,m})$ in $\mathbb{N}$ such that $\lim_{n_{k,m} \to \infty} d(\omega_{n_{k,m}+r_m}(x_{1,m}), \omega_{n_{k,m}+r_m}(x_{2,m})) = 0$. Choose $s_m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(\omega_{s_m+r_m}(x_{1,m}), \omega_{s_m+r_m}(x_{2,m})) < \frac{1}{3.2^m}$. Also, by corollary 2, $d(\omega_{s_m+r_m}(x_{i,m}), f^{s_m}(\omega_{r_m}(x_{i,m}))) < \sum_{i=1}^{s_m} D(f_{r_m+i}, f) < \frac{1}{3.2^m}$ and hence by triangle inequality, we have $d(f^{s_m}(\omega_{r_m}(x_{1,m})), f^{s_m}(\omega_{r_m}(x_{2,m}))) < \frac{1}{2^m}$.

Note that $\omega_{r_m}(x_{i,m}) \in U_{i,m}$ and assuming $u_{i,m} = \omega_{r_m}(x_{i,m})$ yields $d(f^{s_m}(u_{1,m}), f^{s_m}(u_{2,m})) < \frac{1}{2^m}$. Thus, there exists neighborhoods $U_{i,m+1}$ of $u_{i,m}$ such that $\overline{U_{i,m+1}} \subset U_{i,m}$ and $d(f^{s_m}(\omega_{r_m}(x)), f^{s_m}(\omega_{r_m}(y))) < \frac{1}{2^m}$ for all $x \in U_{1,m+1}, y \in U_{2,m+1}$.

Repeating the process for each m, we obtain a nested sequence of open sets $U_{i,m+1}, \overline{U_{i,m+1}} \subset U_{i,m} \subset U_i$ such that $d(f^{s_m}(\omega_{r_m}(x)), f^{s_m}(\omega_{r_m}(y))) < \frac{1}{2^m}$ for all $x \in U_{1,m+1}, y \in U_{2,m+1}$. As $\overline{U_{i,m+1}}$ is a nested decreasing sequence of closed sets in a compact metric space and hence $\bigcap_{m=0}^{\infty} \overline{U_{i,m}} \neq \phi$. Then, for any $u_1 \in \bigcap_{m=0}^{\infty} \overline{U_{1,m}} \subset U_1$, $u_2 \in \bigcap_{m=0}^{\infty} \overline{U_{2,m}} \subset U_2$, as $u_i \in U_{i,m}$ for all m, we have $d(f^{s_m}(u_1), f^{s_m}(u_2)) < \frac{1}{2^m}$ for all m and hence (u_1, u_2) is proximal for (X, f). As the proof holds good for any pair of non-empty open sets U_1, U_2 in X, the set of pairs proximal for (X, f) is dense in $X \times X$. □

Remark 10. The proof establishes the equivalence of dense set of proximal pairs for the two systems. It may be noted that the compactness of the space X is once again not fully utilized and the proof holds

good for locally compact spaces. Further, as no additional condition is needed to establish the result, rate of convergence of the sequence (f_n) is sufficient to establish the equivalence of dense set of proximal pairs.

We now give an example to prove that if the maps f_n are not feeble open then equivalence of various dynamical notions for the two systems need not be equivalent.

Example 2. *Let I be the unit interval and let f_1, f_2 be defined as*

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 2x & \text{for } x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}] \\ 2 - 2x & \text{for } x \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \end{cases}$$

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 4x & \text{for } x \in [0, \frac{1}{4}] \\ 1 & \text{for } x \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}] \\ -4x + 4 & \text{for } x \in [\frac{3}{4}, 1] \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathbb{F} = \{g, f, f, \ldots, f, f, \ldots\}$ and $(X, \mathbb{F})$ be the corresponding non-autonomous system. It may be noted that as $g([\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}]) = 1$, for any open set $U \subset [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}]$, $\omega_k(U) = 0$ for all $k \geq 2$ and hence non-autonomous system does not exhibit any form of mixing or sensitivity. However, the sequence $\{g, f, f, \ldots, f, f, \ldots\}$ converges to f. As for any non-empty open set $U \subset [0, 1]$ there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f^k(U) = [0, 1]$, the system (X, f) exhibits all forms of mixing and sensitivities. Consequently, the example establishes that if f_n are not feeble open then any form of mixing or sensitivity is not equivalent for the two systems.

References

[1] **Akin E, Kolyada S,** Li-Yorke Sensitivity, *Nonlinearity,* 16(2003) 1421-1433.

[2] **Block L, Coppel W,** Dynamics in one dimension, *Springer-Verlag, Berlin Hiedelberg* (1992).

[3] **Brin Michael, Stuck Garrett,** Introduction to dynamical systems, *Cambridge University Press* (2002).

[4] **Devaney Robert L,** Introduction to chaotic dynamical systems, *Addison Wesley* (1986).

[5] **Dvorakova J**, Chaos in nonautonomous discrete dynamical systems, *Communications in Nonlinear Svience and Numerical Simulation* 17 (2012) 4649-4652.

[6] **Beer, R.**, Dynamical approaches to cognitive science *Trends in cognitive sciences*, Vol. 4, No. 3, March 2000.

[7] **Hamill J., Emmerik R., Heiderscheit B., Li L.**, A dynamical systems approach to lower extremity running injuries *Clinical biomechanics*, 14(1999), 297-308.

[8] **Oono Y., Kohmoto M.**, Discrete model of chemical turbulence, *Physical review letters* vol. 55 no.27 2927-2931.

[9] **Kolyada S, Snoha L,** Topological entropy of Nonautonomous Dynamical Systems, *Random and Computational Dynamics,* 4(2&3) (1996) 205-233.

[10] **Kolyada S, Snoha L, Trofimchuk S**, On minimality of Non-autonomous Dynamical Systems, *Nonlinear Oscillations*, vol. 7, Issue 1, 2004,8389.
[11] **Sharma P, Raghav M**, Dynamics Of Non-Autonomous Discrete Dynamical Systems, *Topology Proceedings* (accepted).
[12] **Balibrea F, Oprocha P,** Weak mixing and chaos in nonautonomous discrete systems,*Applied Mathematics Letters,* 25(2012) 1135-1141.

Department of Mathematics, I.I.T. Jodhpur, Old Residency Road, Ratanada, Jodhpur-342011, INDIA
E-mail address: puneet.iitd@yahoo.com, manishrghv@gmail.com